

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ADAM DEAN FOX, and  
BARRY GORDON CROFT, JR.,

Defendants.

CASE No. 1:20-CR-183

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

**ORDER**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

The matter is before the Court on Defendant Croft’s motion for an extension of time to file posttrial motions under Rules 29 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. (ECF No. 736). Defendant Croft seeks a 30-day extension due to the “press of other business” and because the “issues presented by the motion are uncommon and require substantial research and briefing.” (ECF No. 736, PageID.9067). Defendant Fox concurs in the relief sought. The government opposes an extension. (ECF No. 739).

The Court does not find good cause for the requested extension. Post-verdict motions are not uncommon. They typically address issues that the parties and the Court have already seen during trial. This case is no exception. There have been dozens of motions briefed and decided throughout the case, including six rule 29s for these two defendants already (two per defendant during each trial, and one per defendant post first trial). Potential Rule 33 issues have also been thoroughly previewed. Any potentially relevant proceedings that did not occur in open court have already been transcribed and made available to the parties. Furthermore, memories of pertinent

facts and events during the trial process fade quickly. There is good reason to honor the existing time limits and no good cause for a 30-day extension.

**ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED** that Defendant Croft's Motion for an Extension (ECF No. 736) is **DENIED**.

Dated: September 2, 2022

/s/ Robert J. Jonker

ROBERT J. JONKER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE